

**D R A F T**

# **2006 to 2008 STIP Criteria & Project Nomination Request**

**Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities  
Division of Program Development**

**Review Package for Public Comments  
August 2004**

**Comments and Project Nominations due: October 8, 2004**

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

### Where to send comments and project nominations

Comments on the draft STIP criteria and match policy should be sent as follows:

2006-2008 STIP Comments  
Alaska DOT&PF  
3132 Channel Drive  
Room 200  
Juneau, AK 99801-7898

or email:

[STIP@dot.state.ak.us](mailto:STIP@dot.state.ak.us)

or by fax:

888 PLANFAX (888-752-6329) toll-free  
465-6984 (in Juneau)

If questions:

888 PLAN DOT (888 752-6368) toll free  
465-4070 (in Juneau)

Project nominations should be sent to the appropriate regional planning office at the appropriate address:

Northern Region Planning Office  
Alaska DOT&PF  
2301 Peger Road  
Fairbanks, AK 99709-5316

Central Region Planning Office  
Alaska DOT&PF  
PO Box 196900  
Anchorage, AK 99519-6900

Southeast Region Planning Office  
Alaska DOT&PF  
6860 Glacier Highway  
Juneau, AK 99801-7999

A map is provided in this package that helps identify which region your community is located within.

**Remember, comments and nominations are due October 8, 2004.**

## Proposed changes to STIP criteria

The changes proposed in the following pages are focused on a few key questions within each set of criteria rather than a wholesale change to all the questions. We have identified certain questions that were not helping define meaningful distinction between projects and have worked to make them work in a more constructive manner. The following changes are proposed:

### Economic Benefits

This question has been modified to consider both costs and benefits of projects in order to ensure the criteria fulfill the requirements of state law governing transportation planning [AS 44.42.050 (a)]. Projects will be given maximum points when they have a high level of monetary benefits that exceed costs whereas projects with fewer benefits will receive fewer points on the scale. Projects lacking such a formal analysis will score zero points.

The changes to the economics benefits question apply to Remote and Trail Projects criteria (question #1) and Rural and Urban Projects criteria (question #1).

### Safety Questions

One change applies to the manner of assigning points for “safety” which has been scored almost universally high in recent years. In doing so the question has lost significance. Under the change, projects with a documented history of significant safety problems will get a maximum number of points, and speculative and lesser safety issues will be scored lower on the scale.

The changes to the safety question apply to Remote and Trail Projects criteria (question #3), Rural and Urban Projects criteria (question #3) and Transit Projects criteria (question #2).

### Other Factors Not Specified Questions

Another noted problem in the STIP scoring process was the use of the question rating “Other factors not specified.” This question has lost meaning as most projects received maximum scores. This means that the question does not fairly distinguish between more deserving and less deserving projects.

Under the proposed change each PEB member would be allocated a maximum pool of points to be applied to this question. Each project in a

STIP category would add 2 points to the pool, and the scorer can assign between 0 – 5 points to any single project, subject to the maximum number in the pool. If there were ten projects being considered, the PEB member could allocate not more than 20 points (10 projects x 2 points). If 4 projects were then given 5 points (4 x 5 = 20), then all other projects he or she scored would receive 0 points. The proposed change would ensure that this question is not routinely scored at a high level. Negative points may also be used to address projects that are of excessive scope, budget or have other negative factors.

The proposed change to the “other factors” question applies to Remote and Trail Projects criteria (question # 13), Rural and Urban Projects criteria (question #15), TRAAK Projects criteria (question #11), and Transit Projects criteria (question # 13).

### Project Sponsor Questions

Another change is the scoring for cash or in-kind contributions from the project sponsor. With the new match policy now in place requiring match from non-state sponsors for many projects, the required match amounts would not be credited. Only contributions over the required sponsor match amount would be considered in scoring.

The proposed change to the “project sponsor” question applies to Remote and Trail Projects criteria (question # 5), Rural and Urban Projects criteria (question #5), TRAAK Projects criteria (question #3a and 3b), and Transit Projects criteria (question # 4), and Intelligent Transportation Projects criteria (question #5).

### Functional Classification Question

In the Rural and Urban Projects criteria, question #14 was changed to significantly favor higher functional class routes. The points assigned to lower functional class roads including minor collectors and local roads was reduced. This was done to reflect the need to redirect scarce transportation funds to those roads that are important to the state’s network of most significant roads.

### Cost Effectiveness Question

In the Rural and Urban criteria, question #11 was changed. This question attempts to measure the most cost effective projects by mathematically calculating the cost per mile, per average daily traffic served. Previously we used fixed dollar amounts for each possible score, from +5 to –5 points. Under the new approach, all projects would be calculated, and then sorted into 11 “bins.” Each bin would receive an

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

approximately equal number of projects in rank order. This approach ensures even distribution of the points and can readily adjust to dollar levels that may change due to unforeseen cost and inflation factors. It guarantees that all 11 score bins will be used in an equitable manner.

### Equalizing possible weight and points between competing STIP categories

#### Maximum weight for each STIP category

Several of the STIP scoring categories result in projects competing for the same limited funds, though they are scored using different sets of criteria. If the maximum number of points is different there is a significant inequity in making such comparisons. In particular, the Rural and Urban Projects criteria suffered from this disadvantage. For example, there are pairs of questions that are either/or. If you answer one of these questions, then the points cannot be assigned for the other question in the pair. This practically reduces the maximum total weight for these criteria.

Throughout several of the criteria, the weights were adjusted to make all criteria that compete for the same funds, equal in terms of the maximum weight that can be assigned. In a few cases questions were rearranged and combined to make the total weight possible in each STIP category more readily understandable.

#### Maximum points for sponsor contribution questions

Certain questions on local sponsor contributions were modified to reflect the maximum number of points that can be earned for local contribution to 5 instead of 20. By making up to 15 possible bonus points on these questions, projects not on the state network can readily score much higher than state-owned road and highway projects, skewing scarce funding away from the primary network of transportation routes. This change now makes local sponsored projects compete without an unfair advantage.

The proposed change to the “sponsor contribution” question maximum points applies to the Transit Projects criteria (question #4) and in the Intelligent Transportation Projects criteria (question #5).

### Why TRAAK project nominations are not being called for?

Changes to the TRAAK criteria are proposed simply to remain consistent with changes being made to other STIP categories. This program has been greatly reduced by legislation passed in 2003 (AS 19.15.025). The change had the effect of substantially reducing the amounts of funds that can be used for projects in the TRAAK program. This reduction, coupled with a large number of projects already begun requires we focus limited funding on those projects ready for construction, at least through the 2008 year. With no funding to spend on new TRAAK projects, there is no purpose to either seek nominations or score them. The new state law, passed in 2003, reads:

#### *AS 19.15.025*

*(a) Before October 1, 2006, the department may annually allocate up to four percent of nonrestricted federal-aid highway apportionments to projects classified under the trails and recreational access for Alaska program under a statewide transportation improvement program. On or after October 1, 2006, the department may allocate up to two percent of nonrestricted federal-aid highway apportionments to projects classified under the trails and recreational access for Alaska program under a statewide transportation improvement program.”*

As required by this law, the department must shrink spending on the TRAAK program by 75% as compared to 2003 and previously. This change in law is being reflected in project selection for the STIP and means there is no room for new TRAAK nominations for several years.

### Format of changes to STIP criteria

Proposed changes in the criteria follow this format:

*New language is shown as italics.*

~~Deleted language is shown in strike through.~~

Remote and Trail Projects Criteria					
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. <b>Economic benefits</b> following construction.  Weighting: 4	Supports economic benefit; endorsed in an economic development project by regional governmental agency or representative group.	Supports capacity or new access specifically built to support regional or local industrial, commercial or resource development	Supports minimal, speculative or temporary economic opportunities or benefits or provides non-crucial benefit to existing economic activity.	N/A	N/A
1. <b>Economic benefits.</b>  Weighting: 2	Consideration of an analysis of costs and benefits demonstrates:  project has very significant monetary benefits.  project has above average monetary benefits. (Score typical or average benefits = 2)			N/A	N/A
		project has below average monetary benefits; or no documentation provided.			
Economic benefits analysis shall not consider benefits due to project construction.					
2. <b>Health and quality of life</b> (Air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, access to basic necessities) Weighting: 5	This project provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life, or reduces or removes a significant existing negative factor.	This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life, or reduces or removes an existing negative factor.	Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.	This project provides a moderate degradation to health or quality of life.	This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.
Examples: Access to basic sanitation = 5; dust control = 4– 5; access to medical facility = 3.					
3. <del><b>Safety.</b></del>  Weighting: 5	<del>Addresses demonstrated safety problem of significance.</del>	<del>Addresses demonstrated safety problem of moderate nature or there is a record of public concern.</del>	<del>Less than 5% of project addresses safety.</del>	N/A	N/A
3. <b>Safety.</b>  Weighting: 5	Strongly addresses a significant and existing safety problem.	Addresses demonstrated existing safety problem of moderate nature.	No record of safety issues addressed by project or it is not primary purpose of project.	N/A	N/A
10 year record: 2 or more deaths or major injuries = 5; 1 major injury = 3; speculative or anecdotal safety problem = maximum points 2.					

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

Remote and Trail Projects Criteria					
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
4. Improves <b>intermodal transportation</b> or lessens redundant facilities.  Weighting: 2	Greatly improves the connectivity between modes and coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems and services and/or would clearly reduce the need for significant capital investment in another mode.	Moderately improves the connectivity between modes and enhances coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems and/or would clearly reduce the need for moderate capital investment in another mode.	Minimal or no effect on transportation system connectivity, or coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems and services and does not change the requirement for investment in other modes.	Moderately decreases the connectivity between modes or decreases coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems and/or would clearly require the need for moderate capital investment in another mode.	Greatly decreases the connectivity between modes or decreases coordination and integration of passenger and freight systems and/or would clearly require the need for significant capital investment in another mode.
5. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund capital costs</b> . Weighting: 2 4	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: 1 point per each 5-20% of project cost.		Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A
Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered.					
6. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund M&amp;O costs</b> . (For non-DOT or DOT unsuited to long-term ownership).  Weighting: 5	Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor contributes nothing.  Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally-owned facility = 1 pt.; And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts.	N/A	N/A
STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned.					
7. Departmental <b>M&amp;O priority</b> (Use for DOT&PF facilities.) Weighting: 5	Very high M&O priority.	Moderate M&O priority.	Not an M&O priority.	Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately.	Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs significantly.

Remote and Trail Projects Criteria					
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
8. <b>Public support.</b>  Weighting: 3	Preponderance of public record including a resolution from the local elected body shows support for project and fully supported in official state/local plans.	Majority of public record shows support for project; and nominally supported in official state/local plans.	Public record is divided or undocumented toward project	Majority of public record shows opposition to project; and not supported in official state/local plans.	Preponderance of public record shows opposition to project including a resolution from the local elected body and contravenes official state/local plans.
9. <b>Environmental approval</b> readiness  Weighting: 2	Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion or already complete.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment or draft documents circulated.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval extremely difficult 50/50 chance.	Environmental approval unlikely.
10. Will project provide new and/or <b>improved access</b> to the noted uses: water sources, landfills, sewage lagoons/honey bucket sites, health care, airports, subsistence sites, or river/ocean access? Weighting: 5	New access to two or more uses = 5.	New access to one = 3; Improved access to two or more = 2; Improved access to one of listed uses = 1.	None of uses listed.	N/A	N/A
11. <b>System preservation.</b>  Weighting: 3	Major purpose of project is to extend the life of existing facility by 10 or more years.	Secondary purpose of project is to extend life of existing facility by 10 or more years.	Preservation is not significant purpose of the project.	N/A	N/A
12. Is this a <b>joint project</b> with ADEC, BIA or PHS? Weighting: 4	Yes.	N/A	No.	N/A	N/A

Comments and nominations due October 8, 2004

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

Remote and Trail Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
13. <del>Other factors</del> not specified.  Weighting: 2	Project exhibits significant innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits moderate innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits no innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	N/A	N/A
13. <del>Other factors</del> not specified.  Weighting: 2	Each PEB member is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.			Negative points may be assigned to projects that are excessive in scope, cost or deemed not in state's interest.	

Total Weight = 47



Urban and Rural Projects Criteria					
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. <b>Economic benefits</b> following construction.  Weighting: 2	Supports significant new, identifiable, permanent economic opportunities or benefits of statewide or interstate scope.	Supports moderate new, identifiable, permanent economic opportunities or benefits of regional or local scope.	Supports minimal, speculative or temporary economic opportunities or benefits or provides non-crucial benefit to existing economic activity.	N/A	N/A
1. <b>Economic benefits.</b>  Weighting: 5	Consideration of an analysis of costs and benefits demonstrates:  project has very significant monetary benefits.  project with above average monetary benefits. (Score typical or average benefits = 2)			N/A	N/A
	project with below average monetary benefits; or no documentation provided.				
Economic benefits analysis shall not consider benefits due to project construction.					
2. <b>Health and quality of life</b> (Air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, access to basic necessities) Weighting: 1	This project provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life, or reduces or removes a significant existing negative factor.	This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life, or reduces or removes an existing negative factor.	Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.	This project provides a moderate degradation to health or quality of life.	This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.
3. <b>Safety.</b>  Weighting: 5	HSIP priority = 5 60% - 80% = 4 80% - 100% = 5	5% - 20% = 1 20% - 40% = 2 40% - 60% = 3	Less than 5% of project addresses safety.	N/A	N/A
3. <b>Safety.</b>  Weighting: 5	Strongly addresses a significant and existing safety problem.	Addresses demonstrated existing safety problem of moderate nature.	No record of safety issues addressed by project or it is not primary purpose of project.	N/A	N/A
10 year record: 2 or more deaths or major injuries = 5; 1 major injury = 3; speculative or anecdotal safety problem = maximum points 2.					

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria					
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
4. Improves <b>intermodal transportation</b> or lessens redundant facilities.  Weighting: 2-3	Would clearly reduce the need for capital investment in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or greatly improves the connection between modes for travelers or freight.	May reduce the need for capital investment in another mode and result in a reduction in operating costs by reducing redundancy in our system or would moderately improve the connection between modes for travelers or freight.	Does not impact other mode requirements.	May increase demand on another mode possibly requiring additional capital expenditure.	Will increase demand on another mode requiring additional capital expenditure.
5. Local, other agency or user <b>contribution to fund capital costs.</b> Weighting: 4	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: <del>no point limit</del> – 1 pt per each 5 20% of project cost.		Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A
Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered.					
6a. Local, other agency or user <b>contribution to fund M&amp;O costs.</b> (For non-DOT or DOT unsuited to long-term ownership.)  Weighting: 0 or 5	Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor contributes nothing.  Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally owned facility = 1 pt.; And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts.	N/A	N/A
STIP commitment must be in writing and passed by the governing body of the community or tribe before points will be assigned.					
7. 6b. Departmental <b>M&amp;O costs</b> and priority (Use for DOT facilities.) Weighting: 0 or 5	Very high M&O priority.	Moderate M&O priority.	Not an M&O priority; little effect on M&O costs.	Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs moderately.	Not an M&O priority; would increase M&O costs significantly.
Questions #6 & #7 to be relabeled #6a & 6b. Use 6a or 6b, not both. All other questions to be renumbered in final draft.					

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
<b>8. Public support?</b>  Weighting: 3	Preponderance of public record including a resolution from the local elected body shows support for project and fully supported in official state or local plans.	Majority of public record shows support for project; and nominally supported in official state or local plans.	Public record is divided or undocumented toward project; and not supported in official state or local plans.	Majority of public record shows opposition to project; and not supported in official state/local plans.	Preponderance of public record shows opposition to project including a resolution from the local elected body and/or contravenes official state/local plans.
<b>9. Environmental approval readiness?</b>  Weighting: 2	Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion or already complete.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment or draft document circulated.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval extremely difficult 50/50 chance.	Environmental approval unlikely.
<b>10. Surface rehabilitation. or deficient width/grade/alignment (w/g/a).</b>  Weighting: 4 5	Primarily 3-R and a PMS recommendation for rehab within 2 years, or a gravel surface badly deteriorated or serious surface deformation. or Significantly deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Primarily 3-R; a portion of the project addresses serious foundation problems. or Moderately deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Primarily major reconstruction; addresses longer-range rehabilitation. or No w/g/a deficiencies.	N/A	N/A
<b>11. Cost, length, AADT evaluation.</b> Divide project cost (in thousands) by length (in miles) and further divide result by Avg. Annual Daily Traffic. Weighting: 4	Between: <del>0 – 55¢ = 5</del> 55¢ – 80¢ = 4	Between: <del>80¢ – \$1.10 = 3</del> <del>\$1.10 – \$1.50 = 2</del> <del>\$1.50 – \$2.50 = 1</del>	Between: <del>\$2.50 – \$3.00 = 0</del>	Between: <del>\$3.00 – \$4.00 = 1</del> <del>\$4.00 – \$6.00 = 2</del> <del>\$6.00 – \$10.00 = 3</del>	Between: <del>\$10.00 – \$54.00 = 4</del> <del>\$54.00 – ∞ = 5</del>

Comments and nominations due October 8, 2004

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

Urban and Rural Projects Criteria					
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
<b>11. Cost, length, AADT evaluation.</b>  <i>Weighting: 4</i>	Divide project cost (in thousands) by length (in miles) and further divide result by Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT). After calculation, sort all projects into 11 "bins" based on cost evaluation and equal distribution of the number of projects per bin. (Example: If 55 projects there would be 5 projects per bin.) Each succeeding bin gets 1 less point, from +5 to -5. Least expensive bin gets +5 points.				
<b>12. Deficient bridges?</b>  <i>Weighting: 3</i>	Deficient bridge(s) needing replacement*.	Deficient bridge(s) eligible for rehabilitation**.	No bridge deficiencies	N/A	N/A
* "Eligible for <i>replacement</i> " means the bridge has a sufficiency rating of less than 50 points and has been determined to be eligible for replacement by ADOT&PF Bridge section. ** "Eligible for <i>rehabilitation</i> " means the bridge has a sufficiency rating between 50 and 80 points and has been determined to be eligible for rehabilitation by ADOT&PF Bridge section.					
<b>13. <sup>b</sup>Deficient width/grade/alignment</b>  <i>Weighting: 3</i>	Significantly deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	Moderately deficient w/g/a relative to standards.	No w/g/a deficiencies.	N/A	N/A
<i>Question #13 to be merged with question #10. All following questions shall be renumbered in final draft.</i>					
<b>14. Functional class.</b>  <i>Weighting: 2 5</i>	Major Arterial = 5 Minor Arterial = 4	Major Collector or Urban Collector = 3	Minor Collector N/A	Minor Collector = -3 Local Roads/Streets	Local Roads/Streets or Unclassified = -5 N/A
<b>15. <del>Other factors</del> not specified.</b>  <i>Weighting: 2</i>	Project exhibits significant innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits moderate innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	Project exhibits no innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.	N/A	N/A
<b>15. <del>Other factors</del> not specified.</b>  <i>Weighting: 2</i>	Each PEB member is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.			Negative points may be assigned to projects that are excessive in scope, cost or deemed not in state's interest.	

Total Weight = 47

TAAK Projects Criteria					
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
<i>Please note: The maximum financial size of the TAAK Program was reduced by statute (AS 19.15.025) and as a consequence no project nominations will be considered for the 2006 - 2008 STIP. All funds directed to TAAK program will apply to projects that are already underway and the earliest that further nominations for TAAK will be consider Is two years hence for the 2008-2010 STIP. Some changes are being proposed to these criteria to keep them consistent with other STIP categories.</i>					
<b>1. Health and quality of life</b> Air and water quality, neighborhood continuity, enhanced recreational opportunities, enhanced understanding of natural and manmade environment.  Weighting: 4	This project provides a significant contribution to improved health or quality of life through reduction or removal of existing negative factor or provision of a new facility that improves quality of life.	This project provides a moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life through reduction or removal of existing negative factor or provision of a new facility that improves quality of life.	Project will have no effect either positive or negative on quality of life issues.	This project provides a moderate degradation to health or quality of life.	This project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.
<b>2. Safety.</b>  Weighting: 5	Addresses demonstrated safety problem of significance.	Addresses demonstrated safety problem of moderate nature or there is a record of public concern.	Project does not have a safety component.	Project will have a minor adverse effect on safety.	Project will have a major adverse effect on safety.
<b>3a. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund capital costs</b> excluding land.  Weighting: 4	Contributions covers 25% or more of project costs. Note: award 1 point for each 5% contribution.	Note: award 1 point for each 5% contribution.	No contribution.	N/A	N/A
<b>3b. Local, other agency or user contribution of land to project.</b>  Weighting: 4	Contribution of land for entire facility, plus change of land status to permanently dedicate land for project.	Contribution of land for less than entire facility plus permanent dedication: points proportionate to land contributed for project.	Public agency provides land already dedicated for project: 2 pts.	N/A	N/A
<i>3 a &amp; 3b: Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required contribution shall be considered.</i>					

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

TRAAK Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
4a. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>assume ownership, including operations &amp; maintenance costs (DOT facilities)</b> . Weighting: 4	Sponsor will assume ownership of DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility of DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A
<i>Commitment must be in writing and approved by legislative body before points will be assigned.</i>					
4b. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund operations and maintenance (O&amp;M) costs</b> . (Use for non-DOT facilities). Weighting: 3	Sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance responsibility for new facility.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility (but not ownership); or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost	Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally-owned facility = 2 pts.; and results in significant local maintenance savings = 3 pts.	Sponsor assumes ownership, but not M&O responsibility	Sponsor assumes neither ownership nor M&O responsibility
5. <b>Public support</b> .  Weighting: 4	Preponderance of public record including a resolution from the local elected body shows support for project and fully supported in official State, local or Federal plans.	Majority of public record shows support for project and fully supported in official State, local or Federal plans (4); or nominally supported in official State, local or Federal plans (3).	Public record is divided or undocumented toward project	Majority of public record shows opposition to project; and not supported in official State, local or Federal plans.	Preponderance of public record shows opposition to project including a resolution from the local elected body and contravenes official State, local or Federal plans.
6. <b>Project bridges gap or removes barrier</b> between existing trail systems or provides interpretive center or rest area continuity. Weighting: 2 3	Project provides an important connection (bridges gap, removes barrier or provides interp. or rest area continuity).	Project provides a modest connection. (bridges gap, removes barrier or provides interp. or rest area continuity).	No gaps bridged or a barrier removed but does connect to existing networks.	Project creates barrier or displaces existing non-motorized uses.	N/A
7. Project is tied to an annual recreational, educational or tourism <b>event or activity</b> ? This project would strongly support/sustain this event/? Weighting: 2	Event or activity is of statewide or regional significance and well known/long standing. Yes to both (5), yes to one (4).	Event or activity is local and well known/long standing. Yes to both (3) or yes to one (2). Event is new but growing in importance (1).	Event is minor and local.	N/A	N/A

TRAAK Projects Criteria					
			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
8. Any of the six <b>intrinsic qualities</b> : scenic, historic, cultural, natural, archaeological, recreational. Weighting: 3	One point for each quality; maximum 5. Project must include interpretation of historic, cultural, natural and archaeological attributes for points.		None.	N/A	N/A
9. Project includes <b>Stabilization or renovation of a historic property</b> related to transportation  Weighting: 4	Nomination includes letter or other documentation of inclusion of the renovated property on the National Historic Register.	Nomination includes letter of support from Office of History & Archeology that declares the property to be of significant (4 or 3), or of moderate (2 or 1) historical importance.	Project does not include stabilization or renovation of a historic property.	N/A	Project will harm or reduce in value an historic property.
10. <b>Capital cost</b>  Weighting: 4 5	Total project cost (all phases): \$250,000 or less = 5	Total project cost (all phases): \$250,000-\$500,000 = 3	Total project cost (all phases): \$500,000-\$750,000 = 1 \$750,000 or more = 0	N/A	N/A
11. <del>Other factors</del> not specified.  Weighting: 2	<del>Project exhibits significant innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.</del>	<del>Project exhibits moderate innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.</del>	<del>Project exhibits no innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.</del>	N/A	N/A
11. <b>Other factors</b> not specified.  Weighting: 2	Each PEB member is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.			Negative points may be assigned to projects that are excessive in scope, cost or deemed not in state's interest.	

Total Weight = 47

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

Transit Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. <b>Health and quality of life</b> (Neighborhood continuity, access to basic necessities) Weighting: 3	Project provides significant contribution to improved health or quality of life.	Project provides moderate contribution to improved health or quality of life.	Project will have no effect, either positive or negative, on quality of life issues.	Project provides a moderate degradation to health or quality of life.	Project provides a significant degradation to health or quality of life.
<del>2. <b>Safety.</b></del>  Weighting: 4	<del>Addresses demonstrated safety problem of significance.</del>	<del>Addresses demonstrated safety problem of moderate nature or there is a record of public concern.</del>	<del>Project has no effect on safety.</del>	N/A	N/A
2. <b>Safety.</b>  Weighting: 2	Strongly addresses a significant and existing safety problem.	Addresses demonstrated existing safety problem of moderate nature.	No record of safety issues addressed by project or it is not primary purpose of project.	N/A	N/A
<i>10 year record: 2 or more deaths or major injuries = 5; 1 major injury = 3; speculative or anecdotal safety problem = maximum points 2.</i>					
3. Improves <b>intermodal transportation</b> or reduces redundant facilities.  Weighting: 2 3	Greatly improves connectivity between modes and coordination and integration of passenger systems and/or would clearly reduce the need for significant capital investment in another mode.	Moderately improves connectivity between modes and coordination and integration of passenger systems and/or would clearly reduce the need for capital investment in another mode.	Minimal to no effect on transportation system connectivity, or coordination and integration of passenger systems and services, and does not change the requirement for investment in other modes.	Moderately decreases the connectivity between modes, or decreases coordination and integration of passenger systems and services and/or results in redundant investments.	Greatly decreases the connectivity between modes or coordination and integration of passenger systems, and/or results in redundant investments.
4. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund capital costs.</b> Weighting: 5	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: <del>no point limit</del> 1 pt per each 5 20% of project cost <i>exceeding required match.</i>		Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A
<i>Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered.</i>					



Transit Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
5. Local contribution to <b>fund operations and maintenance</b> (O&M) costs. Weighting: 5	Local or user contributions cover 100% of O&M costs, and includes ownership of facility.	One point for each 20% of local support of O&M costs.	Local or user contributions cover none of O&M costs.	N/A	N/A
6. <b>Public support.</b>  Weighting: 3	Preponderance of public record including a resolution from the local elected body shows support for project and fully supported in official state/local plans.	Majority of public record shows support for project; and nominally supported in official state/local plans.	Public record is divided or undocumented toward project	Majority of public record shows opposition to project; and not supported in official state/local plans.	Preponderance of public record shows opposition to project including a resolution from the local elected body and contravenes official state/local plans.
7. <b>Environmental approval</b> readiness.  Weighting: 1	Environmental approval likely with Categorical Exclusion or already complete.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Assessment or draft document circulated.	Environmental approval likely with Environmental Impact Statement.	Environmental approval extremely difficult 50/50 chance.	Environmental approval unlikely.
8. <b>System continuity</b> and maintenance (vehicles).  Weighting: 4	Project replaces currently operating vehicles that are at or beyond FTA replacement standards.	Project provides vehicles to expand service.	Vehicles will neither replace currently operating vehicles nor expand service.	N/A	N/A
9. Is the project listed in <b>State Air Quality Implementation Plan?</b> Weighting: 2	Yes, a required element.	Yes, a contingency element = 4. No, but qualifies for CMAQ funds = 2-3.	Not listed in plan; does not qualify for CMAQ funds; no significant air quality impacts.	No, and project will have moderate negative air quality impacts.	No, and project will have significant negative air quality impacts.
10. Has local agency <b>exhausted FTA/ other funding sources?</b> Weighting: 3	Yes, including filing of FTA 5309 application.	Yes, excluding FTA 5309 funding.	No, but FTA funding unlikely.	No, and FTA funding a possibility.	No, and FTA funding a strong possibility.
11. Does project support <b>private-non-profit (PNP) providers?</b> Weighting: 4	Yes, will replace existing PNP agency vehicle, which scored above 90 on FTA 5310 ranking.	Yes, new vehicle for PNP provider that scored above 90 on FTA 5310 ranking.	No.	N/A	N/A

Comments and nominations due October 8, 2004

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

Transit Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
12. Will project support <b>coordinated service or brokerage</b> ? Weighting: 4 5	Yes, with 5 or more agencies participating.	Yes, with 3 agencies participating.	No.	No, even though coordinated system/brokerage is in operation in community.	N/A
13. <b>Increased mobility</b> for the disadvantaged.  Weighting: 5	Increased mobility for elderly, persons with disabilities, or economically disadvantaged is major benefit of project; and/or necessary for existing facility or system to comply with ADA.	Increased mobility for elderly, persons with disabilities, or economically disadvantaged is moderate benefit of project.	Meets ADA requirements but has limited benefits for mobility disadvantaged.	Will require substantial cost to meet ADA requirements.	No intention/ impossible to meet ADA requirements.
<del>13. <b>Other factors</b> not specified.</del>  <del>Weighting: 2</del>	<del>Project exhibits significant innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.</del>	<del>Project exhibits moderate innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.</del>	<del>Project exhibits no innovation, creativity or unique benefits not otherwise rated.</del>	N/A	N/A
13. <b>Other factors</b> not specified.  Weighting: 2	Each PEB member is allocated 2 points for each project scored. Between 0-5 points may be allocated to each project from this "pool" of points. Points from Transit, Remote, Rural/Urban and other STIP categories must be used for projects within the same category.			Negative points may be assigned to projects that are excessive in scope, cost or deemed not in state's interest.	

Maximum Weight: 47

Intelligent Transportation System Projects Pre-Screening Criteria					
Standards	Yes	No			
A. Clear and complete <b>project and operational plan</b> definition? Yes/No	Project implementation and operation plan clearly defined. <b>(Yes; project may proceed to B.)</b>	Project implementation and operation plan inadequate. <b>(No; project not eligible for consideration.)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
B. Project <b>fulfills Alaska and National ITS Architecture?</b> Yes/No	Project is clearly defined to fully conform to Alaska and National ITS architecture. <b>(Yes; project may proceed to C.)</b>	Project not defined to meet Alaska and National ITS architecture. <b>(No; project not eligible for consideration.)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
C. Project <b>adheres to NTCIP* requirements?</b> (Unless legacy systems prevent such requirement.) Yes/No	Project documentation clearly identifies all NTCIP requirements and is designed to meet them. <b>(Yes; project may proceed to scoring.)</b>	Vague identification of NTCIP requirements or no indication that they will be conformed to. <b>(No; project not eligible for consideration.)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*NTCIP = "National Transportation Communication for ITS Protocols."

Intelligent Transportation System Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. Fosters department's mission and goals defined in <b>ITS Plan?</b> (Efficiency and reliability; safety & Homeland Security; quality of life; and, multimodal mobility.) Weighting: 10	Strongly supports three or more of the key goals defined in ITS Strategy.	Strongly supports two of the key goals defined in ITS Strategy.	Support of key goals is minimal, speculative or temporary.	N/A	N/A
2. <b>Enhances</b> the department's operating budget.  Weighting: 5	Project provides a significant contribution to department operating budget (>250,000)	Project provides a moderate contribution to department operating budget (\$150,000)	Project will have no or minimal effect on department budget. (\$50,000)	This project will cause the department to incur significant new costs not offset by savings, revenue or avoided costs.	N/A

Comments and nominations due October 8, 2004

## 2006 – 2008 STIP Project Scoring Criteria Review Draft

Intelligent Transportation System Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
3. <b>Integration</b> within department ITS Plan?  Weighting: 3	Project concept strongly integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	Project concept moderately integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	Project concept minimally integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	N/A	N/A
4. <b>Integration external</b> to department including other agencies and/or private sector. Weighting: 3	Project concept strongly integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	Project concept moderately integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	Project concept minimally integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	N/A	N/A
5. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund project development</b> .  Weighting: 3	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: 1 point per each \$ 20% of project cost. Maximum=20 5.	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: 1 point per each \$ 20% of project cost.	Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A
6. Local, other agency or user contribution to <b>fund M&amp;O costs</b> . (For non- DOT or DOT unsuited to long-term ownership).  Weighting: 3	Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor contributes nothing. Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally owned facility = 1 pt.; And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts.	N/A	N/A
<i>Match required by state match policy shall not be considered In this question. Only contributions that exceed the required match contribution shall be considered.</i>					
7. Magnitude of <b>project costs</b> including capital and operating. (Include allied projects in cost calculation.) Weighting: 5	Project cost of less than \$1 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project cost of less than \$3 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project cost of less than \$5 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project requires \$5 million or more including operating costs for 5 years.	Project requires \$10 million or more including operating costs for 5 years.
8. <b>Sustainability</b> of technology involved.  Weighting: 5	Project relies on technology proven sustainable in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of long-term project success is very high.	Project relies on technology used but not considered proven sustainable in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of project long-term project success is moderately high.	Project relies on technology yet unproven in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of project success unknown.	N/A	N/A

Intelligent Transportation System Projects Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	Scoring Criteria (0)	(-3)	(-5)
9. <b>Multi-use potential.</b> Weighting: 5	Project technology expands ITS potential beyond this project significantly.	Project technology expands ITS potential beyond this project moderately.	Little or no ITS expansion potential offered by this project.	N/A	N/A
10. <b>Time to completion.</b> Weighting: 3	Project implementation likely <18 months.	Project implementation >18 months, but <36 months.	Project implementation >36 months.	N/A	N/A
11. <b>Geographic extent.</b> Weighting: 2	Project beneficiaries in all three regions of state.	Project beneficiaries in at least two regions of state.	Project beneficiaries in only one region or community.	N/A	N/A

Maximum weight = 47